arXiv:1701.09065v2 [math.PR] 9 Feb 2017

Weakly self-interacting piecewise deterministic bacterial chemotaxis.

Pierre Monmarché

CERMICS and INRIA Paris

February 10, 2017

Abstract

A self-interacting velocity jump process is introduced, which behaves in large time similarly to the corresponding self-interacting diffusion, namely the evolution of its normalized occupation measure approaches a deterministic flow.
Key-words: PDMP, self-interacting process, velocity jump process, bouncy particle.
MSC-class: 60F99, 60J75

1 Introduction

Rather than by a diffusion process, the motion of a bacterium in a gradient of chemo-attractors has recently (see [10, 11] and references within) been modelled by a velocity jump process: the particle runs straight ahead at constant speed for some time, until it decides, depending on its environment, to change direction, which is done in a tumble phase which is short enough with respect to the run one to be considered instantaneous.

In the present work we add to this model (more precisely to the dynamic studied in [15]) a self-interacting mechanism, namely we suppose the process is influenced by its past trajectory. Among the many ways to add self-interaction and memory to an initially Markovian dynamic (see the survey [16] for instance), we will consider a weak self-interaction such as introduced in [6] for the diffusion

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = -\left(\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \nabla V(X_t - X_s)\mathrm{d}s\right)\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2}\mathrm{d}B_t, \tag{1}$$

namely a self-interaction that depends on the normalized occupation measure

$$\mu_t = \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \delta_{X_s}\mathrm{d}s.$$

Note that a strong self-interaction, for which by contrast the drift is a function of the non-normalized occupation measure $t\mu_t$, such as studied in [18, 4] for diffusions, is studied in the case of a velocity jump process in [12]. We are interested in the long-time behaviour of the process, and in particular in the question of the influence of the weak self-interaction on this long-time behaviour: if the process tends to go back to where it has already been, is the interaction sufficient to confine it in some localized place ? In particular, if the initial landscape is symmetric, is the interaction strong enough to break the symmetry ? Beyond the modelling question, this is also a first step in the study of stochastic algorithms which are based on similar

processes (see e.g. [3] for the ABP algorithm). In practice, for such algorithms, the underlying Markov process is often a kinetic one rather than an overdamped Langevin diffusion

$$\mathrm{d}X_t \;=\; -\nabla V(X_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2}\mathrm{d}B_t, \tag{2}$$

which is nevertheless used in the theoretical proofs of convergence for the algorithms. In particular, the use of velocity jump processes in stochastic algorithms have recently gained much interest ([8, 17, 15]). To our knowledge, the present work is the first time a convergence result is established for a weakly self-interacting kinetic process.

First, we recall the definition given in [15] of the Markovian velocity jump process, which is in some sense a non-diffusive analoguous of the diffusion (2).

1.1 The Markovian velocity jump process

Denote by $\mathbb{S}^1 = \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ the unit circle, and by $M = \mathbb{S}^1 \times \{-1, +1\}$ its unit tangent bundle. A velocity jump process $(X, Y) \in M$ is a piecewise deterministic Markov process (PDMP) that follows the flow

$$\dot{x} \;=\; y \qquad \dot{y} \;= 0.$$

up to random times where the velocity Y jumps, i.e. is reversed since in dimension 1 there are only two possible unitary velocities -1 and 1. The jump mechanism is thus completely defined by the rate of jump (see [13] for general considerations on PDMP). We will distinguish two different mechanisms:

- The first one is, in a sense, a purely random, dissipative phenomenon: the process jumps at a constant rate $a > 0$.
- The second one is induced by the chemical gradient. We introduce two smooth functions (respectively called the exterior and interaction potentials)

$$\begin{array}{rccc} U & : & \mathbb{S}^1 & \to & \mathbb{R} \\ W & : & \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 & \to & \mathbb{R}, \end{array}$$

  with $W(x,u) = W(u,x)$. For $\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ (where $\mathcal{P}(E)$ stands for the set of probability measures of a space E), or more generally for ν a measure on $\mathbb{S}^1$, and $(x,y) \in M$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} V_\nu(x) &= U(x) + \int W(x,u)\nu(\mathrm{d}u) \\ \lambda(x,y,\nu) &= \left(y\partial_x V_\nu(x)\right)_+ \end{aligned}$$

  where $(\cdot)_+$ stands for the positive part. In this section, ν is constant and we could omit its presence (or in other words we could take $W = 0$), but our aim in the next section will be to replace ν by the occupation measure, which is why we already introduce it now for a notational purpose.

The total rate of jump is $a + \lambda(x,y,\nu)$, meaning that starting from time t_0 the next jump time is defined by

$$T \;=\; \inf\left\{t > t_0,\; E > \int_{t_0}^{t} \left(a + \lambda(X_{t_0} + (s-t_0)Y_{t_0}, Y_{t_0}, \nu)\right)\mathrm{d}s\right\}$$

where E is a random variable with standard (i.e. mean 1) exponential law, independent from the past of the process.

Following [15], we call λ the minimal jump rate, whose interpretation is the following: when it starts its motion, the bacterium draws an exponential variable E which is the total slope of potential it allows itself to climb up. Indeed, $Y_t\partial_x V_\nu(X_t) = \partial_t\left(V_\nu(X_t)\right)$, which means that when the process is moving down the potential, $Y_t\partial_x V_\nu(X_t) < 0$ and thus the minimal rate λ

is zero: the process cannot jump (or more precisely it can only jump through the dissipative mechanism). On the other hand, as long as the potential is increasing along the trajectory,

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} \lambda\left(X_s, Y_s, \mu_s\right) \mathrm{d}s = V_\nu(X_t) - V_\nu(X_{t_0}).$$

When, after successive moves up and down the potential, the cumulated amount of slope the bacterium has climbed up reaches the value E, the process jumps.

Let $(P_t^\nu)_{t\geq 0}$ be the Markov semi-group associated to (X, Y), namely

$$P_t^\nu f(x,y) \quad := \quad \mathbb{E}\left(f(X_t, Y_t) \mid (X_0, Y_0) = (x,y)\right),$$

on functions $f \in L^\infty(M)$. Recall that its infinitesimal generator is defined by

$$L^\nu f(x,y) \quad := \quad (\partial_t)_{|t=0} P_t^\nu f(x,y)$$

whenever this derivative exists. Here, for any smooth function f on M, we have

$$L^\nu f(x,y) \quad = \quad y\partial_x f(x,y) + \left(a + \lambda\left(x,y,\nu\right)\right)\left(f(x,-y) - f(x,y)\right). \tag{3}$$

Before proceeding to the definition of the self-interacting process, let us remark that we supposed the scalar speed to be constant (normalized to 1), whereas Calvez, Raoul and Schmeiser in [10] considered a compact interval of velocities. We think that this choice does not really change the adequacy of the model, which is in both cases very elementary (since anyway we suppose the speed is constant during a run phase, the tumble phase is instantaneous, a run is a straight trajectory, there are no boundaries, the dimension is 1, etc.; this is all of the same order).

What is more disputable in fact is the specific definition of the minimal rate of jump, by which the potentials (hence the chemical environment) are taken into account. Indeed, in our definition the velocity jump process has been tuned (initially for algorithmic purposes in [15]) to have an explicit equilibrium with first marginal the Gibbs measure $e^{-V_\mu(x)}\mathrm{d}x$. This explicit form, which strengthen the idea that our velocity jump process is an analogous of the diffusion (2) (since the latter also admits the Gibbs measure as its equilibrium), will significantly facilitate the subsequent mathematical analysis.

1.2 The self-interacting process

Let U, W and a be as in the previous section. Let (X, Y) be a measurable process on M (namely a measurable function from some probability space Ω to the set of cadlàg functions on M endowed with the Skorokhod topology), $r > 0$, $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ and $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^1)$. We call

$$\mu_t \quad := \quad \frac{r\mu_0 + \int_0^t \delta_{X_s}\mathrm{d}s}{r+t}$$

the (normalized) occupation measure of X at time t with initial weight r and initial value μ_0. In other words, μ_t is the probability measure on $\mathbb{S}^1$ defined by

$$\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t = \frac{r}{r+t}\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_0 + \frac{1}{r+t}\int_0^t f(X_s)\mathrm{d}s.$$

Note that only the position X is concerned, and not the velocity Y. We denote by $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ the filtration associated to $(X_t, Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$.

Definition 1. *We say (X,Y) (or equivalently (X,Y,μ)) is a self-interacting velocity jump process (SIVJP) with parameters r, μ_0, m_0, U, W, a if the law of (X_0,Y_0) is m_0 and if for all smooth f on M and all $(x,y)\in M$,*

$$M_t^f \;:=\; f(X_t,Y_t)-f(X_0,Y_0)-\int_0^t L^{\mu_s}f(X_s,Y_s)\,ds$$

is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale.

All or part of the parameters may be omitted when there is no ambiguity.

Remark: the martingale bracket of M_t^f is classically derived from the carré du champ operator $\Gamma^\mu f := \frac{1}{2}L^\mu f^2 - fL^\mu f$ as

$$[M_t^f, M_t^f] \;=\; 2\int_0^t \Gamma^{\mu_s} f(X_s,Y_s)\mathrm{d}s$$

where here

$$\Gamma^\nu f(x,y) \;=\; (a+\lambda(x,y,\nu))\left(f(x,-y)-f(x,y)\right)^2.$$

We still denote by Γ^ν the associated symmetric bilinear form,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^\nu(f,g)(x,y) &:= \frac{1}{2}\left(L^\nu(fg)-fL^\nu g-gL^\nu f\right)\\ &= (a+\lambda(x,y,\nu))\left(f(x,-y)-f(x,y)\right)\left(g(x,-y)-g(x,y)\right).\end{aligned}$$

For $r>0$, $\nu\in\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$, $(x,y)\in M$ and $t\geq 0$ we write

$$\Phi_{r,t}(x,y,\nu) \;=\; \left(x+ty\;,\;y\;,\;\frac{r\nu+\int_0^t\delta_{x+sy}\mathrm{d}s}{r+t}\right),$$

which is the flow associated to the (inhomogeneous in time) vector field on $M\times\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$

$$b_t(x,y,\nu)=\left(y\;,\;0\;,\;\frac{1}{r+t}\left(\delta_x-\nu\right)\right).$$

Note that

$$\Phi_{r,t_0+t}(x,y,\nu) \;=\; \Phi_{r+t_0,t}\left(\Phi_{r,t_0}(x,y,\nu)\right).$$

In other words, the initial weight r can be interpreted as an initial break-in time, only after which the occupation measure is updated.

An SIVJP can be constructed as follows: from a time t_0 the process (X_t,Y_t,μ_t) evolves deterministically along the flow $\Phi_{r+t_0,\cdot}$ up to the next jump time T which is defined, thanks to a standard exponential r.v. E, as

$$T \;=\; \inf\left\{t>t_0,\; E<\int_{t_0}^t\left(a+\lambda\left(\Phi_{r+t_0,s}\left(X_{t_0},Y_{t_0},\mu_{t_0}\right)\right)\right)\mathrm{d}s\right\}.$$

At time T, Y jumps to $Y_T=-Y_{t_0}$. In other words, the whole process (X,Y,μ) is an inhomogeneous PDMP, whereas (X,Y) alone is not a Markov process. Given the velocity $(Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$, the position X and the occupation measure μ are completely deterministic with

$$\begin{aligned}X_t &= x+\int_0^t Y_s\mathrm{d}s\\ \mu_t &= \frac{r\nu+\int_0^t\delta_{X_s}\mathrm{d}s}{r+t}.\end{aligned}$$

Formally, the infinitesimal generator of (X,Y,μ) is

$$\mathcal{L}_t f(x,y,\mu) \;=\; b_t(x,y,\mu)\cdot\nabla f(x,y,\mu)+(a+\lambda(x,y,\mu))\left(f(x,-y,\mu)-f(x,y,\mu)\right)$$

for smooth functions f on $M\times\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$.

1.3 Main result

Given the potentials U and W, for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$, we define $\pi(\nu) \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ and $\Pi(\nu) \in \mathcal{P}\left(M\right)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\nu)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right) &= \frac{e^{-V_\nu(x)}}{\int e^{-V_\nu(z)}\mathrm{d}z}\mathrm{d}x \\ \Pi(\nu) &= \pi(\nu) \otimes \frac{\delta_{-1}+\delta_1}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Let $(X_t, Y_t, \mu_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a SIVJP with potentials U and W. If μ_t were to converge to some law μ_∞, then for large times (X, Y) should more or less behave as a Markov process with generator L^{μ_∞}. But then, by ergodicity (see Section 2 below), its empirical measure should converge to the unique equilibrium of L^{μ_∞}, which is $\Pi\left(\mu_\infty\right)$. Therefore, a limit of μ_t should necessarily be a fixed point of π.

More precisely, let $Lim\left(\mu\right)$ be the limit set of $(\mu_t)_{t\geq 0}$, namely the set of (weak) limits of convergent sequences $\left(\mu_{t_k}\right)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ when $t_k \to \infty$. Then the following holds:

Theorem 1. *Almost surely, $Lim\left(\mu\right)$ is a compact connected subset of*

$$Fix\left(\pi\right) := \left\{\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right),\ \nu = \pi(\nu)\right\}.$$

Remarks:

- In particular, if $Fix(\pi)$ is constituted of isolated points, then μ converges almost surely.
- A law $m \in Fix(\pi)$ admits a positive density (still denoted by m) with respect to the Lebesgue measure which solves

$$m(x) = \frac{\exp\left(-U(x) - \int W(x,z)m(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)}{\int \exp\left(-U(r) - \int W(r,z)m(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)\mathrm{d}r}.$$

  Such a density m is also an equilibrium of the Mc-Kean Vlasov equation

$$\partial_t m_t = -\partial_x\left(U(x) - \int W(x,z)m_t(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)\partial_x m_t + \Delta m_t. \tag{5}$$

  This deterministic flow on $\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ describe the evolution of the law of a diffusion process whose drift depends on its law. This is a mean-field interaction. For more consideration about the link between mean-field and self-interaction, we refer to [2].

In large times, due to the factor t^{-1}, μ evolves slowly. Hence, for t and T large enough, by ergodicity, the empirical law $\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T}\delta_X$ should be more or less $\pi(\mu_t)$ so that, on average, $\partial_t\left(\mu_t\right) \simeq t^{-1}\left(\pi\left(\mu_t\right) - \mu_t\right)$, or $\partial_t\left(\mu_{e^t}\right) \simeq \pi\left(\mu_{e^t}\right) - \mu_{e^t}$. It is proven in [6, Section 3.1] that, as a vector field,

$$F(\nu) = \pi(\nu) - \nu$$

induces a continuous (for the weak topology) flow Ψ on $\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$, solution of

$$\Psi_0(\nu) = \nu, \qquad \partial_t\Psi_t(\nu) = F\left(\Psi_t(\nu)\right).$$

Our informal reasoning suggests that, in large times, the trajectory of μ should be a perturbation of the flow Ψ. In particular, a possible limit of μ is necessarily an equilibrium of Ψ. Nevertheless, because of randomness, when μ approaches an unstable equilibrium of Ψ, it seems unlikely that it stays in its basin of attraction, and the probability to converge to these equilibrium should be zero. Theorems 2 and 4 below are just a rigorous statement of these ideas.

Note that a point of $Fix\left(\pi\right)$ necessarily admits a positive density $h \in \mathcal{B}_1^+ = \{f \in \mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right),\ f > 0,\ \int f = 1\}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. As shown in [7, Section

2.2] (see [7, Proposition 2.9] for details and proofs of the following assertions), the nature (stable or unstable) of the equilibria of Ψ can be related to the free energy

$$J(h) \quad := \quad \frac{1}{2}\int \left(U(x)+W(x,r)+U(r)\right)h(x)h(r)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}r + \int h(x)\ln h(x)\mathrm{d}x$$

Indeed, $Fix\left(\pi\right)$ is exactly the set of probability laws with a a density $h \in \mathcal{B}_1^+$ which is a critical point for J. For such an h, $\mathcal{B}_0 = \{f \in \mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right),\ \int f = 0\}$ admits a direct sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{B}_0 \quad = \quad \mathcal{B}_0^u(h) \oplus \mathcal{B}_0^c(h) \oplus \mathcal{B}_0^s(h)$$

such that the Hessian $D^2J(h)$ is definite negative (resp. null, resp. definite positive) on $\mathcal{B}_0^u(h)$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_0^c(h)$, resp. $\mathcal{B}_0^s(h)$). The dimensions of $\mathcal{B}_0^u(h)$ and $\mathcal{B}_0^c(h)$ are finite. We say that $\nu \in Fix\left(\pi\right)$ is a non-degenerated fixed point of π if its density h is such that $\mathcal{B}_0^c(h) = \{0\}$, and in that case we say it is a sink (resp. a saddle) of Ψ if $\mathcal{B}_0^u(h) = \{0\}$ (resp. $\neq \{0\}$).

Theorem 2. *Let ν be a sink of Ψ. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_s \underset{s\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \nu\right) \quad > \quad 0.$$

To treat the case of unstable equilibria, we will add an assumption on the interaction W. We say that a symmetric, continuous function $K : \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Mercer kernel if, for all $f \in L^2\left(\mathbb{S}^1, \mathrm{d}x\right)$,

$$\int K(x,r)f(x)f(r)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}r \quad \geqslant \quad 0.$$

Remark 3. *We refer to [7, Section 2.3] for many examples of such kernels, among which we only recall the following: if C is a metric space endowed with a probability measure ν, and $G : \mathbb{S}^1 \times C \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function, then*

$$K(x,r) \quad = \quad \int_C G(x,u)G(r,u)\nu(du)$$

is a Mercer kernel.

Theorem 4. *Suppose $W = W_+ - W_-$ where both W_+ and W_- are Mercer kernels, and let ν be a saddle of Ψ. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_s \underset{s\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \nu\right) \quad = \quad 0.$$

These three results are not surprising, since they are exactly similar to those of Benaïm, Raimond and Ledoux on the self-interacting diffusion (1) (with symmetric interaction). Moreover, the structure of the proofs are very similar. The differences (and the difficulties specific to our study) are, in a sense, mostly technical, and come from the fact that the process under scrutiny, instead of being an elliptic reversible diffusion with nice regularization properties, is a kinetic piecewise deterministic Markov process, with an hybrid dynamic combining continuous time, continuous space, continuous moves and discrete jumps.

Still, the proofs of these three theorem follow so closely the works [7, 6] that, instead of recopying here large segments of the latters for completeness, we made the choice to refer to them as much as possible when the arguments can be straightforwardly adapted to our case, as long as it does not alter much the clarity of the whole presentation. That way, we concentrate on what is really different for the SIVJP, which drastically simplifies the presentation, as many definitions and notations are no more needed. To ease the switching from one work to the other, we tried to keep the same notations.

Once these theoretical results are established, in a second part we turn to the study of the particular case where, denoting $dist_{\mathbb{S}^1}(x,z) = |e^{ix} - e^{iz}|$, the interaction potential is

$$W(x,z) = \rho\left(\frac{1}{2}dist^2_{\mathbb{S}^1}(x,z) - 1\right) = -\rho\cos(x-z)$$

for some $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that, according to Remark 3 and regardless of the sign of ρ, W always satisfies the additional assumption of Theorem 4. We will establish the following:

Theorem 5. *Let (X,Y,μ) be a SIVJP with interaction potential $W(x,z) = -\rho\cos(x-z)$ and exterior potential U. For (a,b) in the unitary disk, define $\overline{\pi}_\rho(a,b) \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ by*

$$\overline{\pi}_\rho(a,b)(dz) \quad = \quad \frac{e^{-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z))}}{\int e^{-U(x)+\rho(a\cos(x)+b\sin(x))}\,dx}dz.$$

1. *If $U = 0$, then*
   - *(i) If $\rho \leqslant 2$ then μ_t almost surely converges to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{S}^1$.*
   - *(ii) If $\rho > 2$ then there exists a deterministic $r(\rho) > 0$ and a random variable $\Theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ such that μ_t almost surely converges to $\overline{\pi}_\rho\left(r\cos\Theta, r\sin\Theta\right)$.*
2. *If $U(z) = -\cos(2z)$, let $\rho_c := \left(\int \cos^2 d\overline{\pi}_\rho(0,0)\right)^{-1}$.*
   - *(i) If $\rho \leqslant \rho_c$, then μ_t almost surely converges to $\overline{\pi}_\rho(0,0)$.*
   - *(ii) If $\rho > \rho_c$, then there exists a deterministic $a_*(\rho) > 0$ and a random variable $\kappa \in \{-1,1\}$ (with positive probability to be 1 and to be -1) such that μ_t almost surely converges to $\overline{\pi}_\rho(\kappa a_*, 0)$.*
3. *If U admits a non-degenerated local minimum at a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$, then for all $\delta > 0$, there exist $\rho_0 > 0$ such that $\rho > \rho_0$ implies*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_{t\to\infty}\left(\int dist^2_{\mathbb{S}^1}(z,x_0)\mu_t\left(dz\right)\right) < \delta\right) \quad > \quad 0.$$

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 are gathered some results on the Markovian velocity jump process without interaction. Theorem 1, 2 and 4 are respectively proved in Section 3.1, 3.1 and 3.3. The case of the quadratic interaction is adressed in 4, in which the different points of Theorem 5 are proved.

2 Preliminary results without self-interaction

In this section, the probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ is fixed, we consider the Markov process (X,Y) on M with generator L^ν defined in (3), and $(P^\nu_t)_{t\geq 0}$ the associated Markov semi-group. Writing $mf = \int f \mathrm{d}m$, we naturally denote by mP^ν_t the image of $m \in \mathcal{P}(M)$ by P^ν_t, defined by duality by $\left(mP^\nu_t\right) f = m\left(P^\nu_t f\right)$. Recall m is said to be invariant (or an equilibrium) for (X,Y) (or equivalently for P^ν_t, or for L^ν) if $mP^\nu_t = m$ for all $t \geq 0$.

Lemma 6. *The law $\Pi(\nu)$, given by (4), is invariant for (X,Y).*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove $\Pi(\nu)L^\nu f = 0$ for all smooth f, which follows from an integration by part (see also [15, Section 1.2]). □

Let $K^\nu f = f - \Pi(\nu)f$ denote the orthogonal projection operator (in $L^2\left(\Pi(\nu)\right)$) on the orthogonal of the constant functions.

Lemma 7. *There exist $\rho, C_1 > 0$ such that for all $t \geqslant 0$, $\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ and $f \in L^\infty(M)$,*

$$\|P^\nu_t K^\nu f\|_\infty \quad \leq \quad C_1 e^{-\rho t}\|K^\nu f\|_\infty.$$

Proof. This is [15, Theorem 4], and the fact that ρ and C_1 do not depend on ν comes from the bound

$$\|\partial_x V_\nu\|_\infty \;\leq\; \|\partial_x U\|_\infty + \|\partial_x W\|_\infty.$$

□

This result implies that $mP_t \overset{weak}{\underset{t\to\infty}{\to}} \Pi(\nu)$ for all $m \in \mathcal{P}(M)$, so that in particular $\Pi(\nu)$ is the unique equilibrium of (X, Y). Moreover, it proves the operator

$$Q^\nu f \;:=\; -\int_0^\infty P_t^\nu K_\nu f \mathrm{d}t$$

is well-defined for $f \in L^\infty(M)$ and satisfies

$$\|Q^\nu f\|_\infty \;\leq\; \frac{C_1}{\rho}\|f\|_\infty. \tag{6}$$

When $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(M)$, it is in the domain of L, so that in particular $\partial_t P_t^\nu f = P_t^\nu L^\nu f = L^\nu P_t^\nu f$ for all $t \geq 0$, and

$$L^\nu Q^\nu f \;=\; Q^\nu L^\nu f \;=\; -\int_0^\infty \partial_t P_t^\nu K^\nu f \mathrm{d}t \;=\; K^\nu f.$$

In the following, we denote by d_{TV} the total variation distance between probability measures,

$$d_{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2) \;:=\; \inf\left\{\mathbb{P}(Z_1 \neq Z_2),\ Law(Z_i) = \nu_i,\ i = 1, 2\right\}.$$

Lemma 8. *For all $t \geq 0$, $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_t^{\nu_1} f - P_t^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty &\leqslant t\|\partial_x W\|_\infty \|f\|_\infty d_{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2)\\ \|K^{\nu_1} f - K^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty &\leqslant 2e^{\|W\|_\infty}\|f\|_\infty d_{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $z \in M$, let $\left(Z_t, \widetilde{Z_t}\right)_{t\geqslant 0}$ be the Markov process on M^2 starting at $\left(Z_0, \widetilde{Z_0}\right) = (z, z)$ and with generator (writing $z_i = (x_i, y_i)$ and $\lambda_{min} = \lambda(z_1, \nu_1) \wedge \lambda(z_2, \nu_2)$)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{L}f(z_1, z_2) \;=\;& (y_1\partial_{x_1} + y_2\partial_{x_2}) f(z_1, z_2) + (a + \lambda_{min})\left(f(x_1, -y_1, x_2, -y_2) - f(z_1, z_2)\right)\\ &+ (\lambda(z_1, \nu_1) - \lambda_{min})_+ \cdot \left(f(x_1, -y_1, z_2) - f(z_1, z_2)\right)\\ &+ (\lambda(z_2, \nu_2) - \lambda_{min})_+ \cdot \left(f(z_1, x_2, -y_2) - f(z_1, z_2)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Then the first marginal Z (resp. the second marginal $\widetilde{Z}$) is a Markov process associated to $P_t^{\nu_1}$ (resp. $P_t^{\nu_2}$), so that

$$\begin{aligned}|P_t^{\nu_1} f(z) - P_t^{\nu_2} f(z)| \;&=\; \left|\mathbb{E}\left(f(Z_t) - f\left(\widetilde{Z_t}\right)\right)\right|\\ &\leqslant\; \|f\|_\infty \mathbb{P}\left(Z_t \neq \widetilde{Z_t}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The dynamic given by $\mathbf{L}$ ensures that, as much as possible, both processes jump simultaneously. Let T be the first time the processes split, namely one of them jumps and not the other. Then, given a standard exponential variable E, T has the same law as

$$\inf\left\{s > 0,\ \int_0^s |\lambda(Z_u, \nu_1) - \lambda(Z_u, \nu_2)|\,\mathrm{d}u > E\right\}$$

(since for $u < T$, $\widetilde{Z_u} = Z_u$). Now, for all $z \in M$,

$$|\lambda(z, \nu_1) - \lambda(z, \nu_2)| \;\leqslant\; \|\partial_x V_{\nu_1} - \partial_x V_{\nu_2}\|_\infty \;\leqslant\; \|\partial_x W\|_\infty d_{TV}(\nu_1, \nu_2),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(Z_t \neq \widetilde{Z_t}\right) &\leqslant \mathbb{P}\left(T < t\right) \\ &\leqslant 1 - e^{-t\|\partial_x W\|_\infty d_{TV}(\nu_1,\nu_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}K^{\nu_1} f(z) - K^{\nu_2} f(z) &= \Pi\left(\nu_2\right) f - \Pi\left(\nu_1\right) f \\ &= \Pi\left(\nu_2\right)\left[\left(f - \Pi\left(\nu_1\right) f\right)\left(1 - e^{V_{\nu_2} - V_{\nu_1}}\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Note that $C = \max\left\{\frac{|1-e^x|}{|x|},\ |x| \leqslant \|W\|_\infty\right\} = \frac{e^{\|W\|_\infty}-1}{\|W\|_\infty}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}\|K^{\nu_1} f - K^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty &\leqslant 2C\|f\|_\infty \|V_{\nu_2} - V_{\nu_1}\|_\infty \\ &\leqslant 2e^{\|W\|_\infty}\|f\|_\infty d_{TV}\left(\nu_1,\nu_2\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 9. *There exists $C_2 > 0$ such that for all $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ and $f \in C^\infty(M)$,*

$$\|Q^{\nu_1} f - Q^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty \leqslant C_2\|f\|_\infty d_{TV}\left(\nu_1,\nu_2\right).$$

Proof. Using that

$$\int_t^\infty P_s^\nu K^\nu f \mathrm{d}s = \int_0^\infty P_{t+s}^\nu K^\nu f \mathrm{d}s = P_t^\nu K^\nu Q^\nu f,$$

we decompose, for any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}Q^{\nu_2} f - Q^{\nu_1} f &= \int_0^t \left[\left(P_s^{\nu_1} - P_s^{\nu_2}\right) K^{\nu_1} f + P_s^{\nu_2}\left(K^{\nu_1} - K^{\nu_2}\right)\right] f \mathrm{d}s + P_t^{\nu_1} K^{\nu_1}\left(Q^{\nu_1} - Q^{\nu_2}\right) f \\ &\quad + \left(P_t^{\nu_1} - P_t^{\nu_2}\right) K^{\nu_1} Q^{\nu_2} f + P_t^{\nu_2}\left(K^{\nu_1} - K^{\nu_2}\right) Q^{\nu_2} f.\end{aligned}$$

Lemmas 7 (with t large enough so that $C_1 e^{-\rho t} < \frac{1}{2}$) and 8 thus yield, for some C,

$$\|Q^{\nu_1} f - Q^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty \leqslant \frac{1}{2}\|Q^{\nu_1} f - Q^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty + C\|f\|_\infty d_{TV}\left(\nu_1,\nu_2\right),$$

which concludes. □

Remark: Lemma 9 is the reason why the whole paper only tackles the case of a position in the one-dimensional torus, and not in any smooth compact manifold of finite dimension (the velocity Y being then in the corresponding unit tangent space). Indeed, all the other results and arguments would be similar in the case of the velocity jump process in dimension d defined in [15]. Nevertheless, in the proof of Lemma 8, when coupling two such d-dimensional processes, at a jump time, even if both jump simultaneously, the new velocities are slightly different (depending on $d_{TV}\left(\nu_1,\nu_2\right)$), and thus even if the coupling is still a success at some time t, the two processes have drifted away one frome the other. Hence, we obtain a bound of the form

$$\|P_t^{\nu_1} f - P_t^{\nu_2} f\|_\infty \leqslant C(t)\left(\|f\|_\infty + \|\nabla f\|_\infty\right) d_{TV}\left(\nu_1,\nu_2\right).$$

for some locally finite function C, which is not a problem by itself. But then in the proof of Lemma 9 (as it is for now) we would need to control $\|\nabla Q f\|_\infty$, and it is unclear whether it is possible. This question may be easier to deal with in the case where the velocity is Gaussian rather than uniform on $\{\pm 1\}$, as proposed in [9].

3 The limiting flow

3.1 Asymptotic pseudotrajectory

Let $(f_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ functions on $\mathbb{S}^1$ which is dense in the unitary ball of $\mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ (endowed with the uniform metric) and for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ let

$$d_w\left(\nu_1, \nu_2\right) \;=\; \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^k} |\nu_1 f - \nu_2 f|,$$

which is a metric that induces the weak topology on $\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$. Then a continuous function ξ from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ is called (see [5]) an asymptotic pseudotrajectory for the flow Ψ if for all T,

$$\sup_{0\leqslant h\leqslant T} d_w\left(\xi(t+h), \Psi_h\left(\xi(t)\right)\right) \;\underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}\; 0.$$

Proposition 10. *Let $(X_t, Y_t, \mu_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a SIVJP with potentials U and W, and $\zeta_t := \mu_{e^t}$. Then ζ is an asymptotic pseudotrajectory for Ψ.*

Proof. Following the proof of [6, Theorem 3.6, parts (i)(b) and (ii)], Proposition 10 ensues from Proposition 11 below. □

Let us first remark Theorem 1 is deduced from this result:

Proof of Theorem 1. The fact that Proposition 10 implies Theorem 1 is proved in [7, Section 4]. More precisely, according to [6, Theorem 3.7], the limit set of an asymptotic pseudotrajectory has the property to be *attractor free* (see [6, Section 3.3] for the definition), and the proof of [7, Theorem 2.4] (which is exactly Theorem 1) only relies on this property and on the flow Ψ, the latter being exactly the same in our case than in the work of Benaïm and Raimond. □

Consider a SIVJP $(X_t, Y_t, \mu_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and let $\zeta_t = \mu_{e^t}$. Set

$$\varepsilon_t(s) \;=\; \int_t^{t+s} \left(\delta_{X_{(e^u)}} - \pi\left(\zeta_u\right)\right) \mathrm{d}u \;=\; \int_{e^t}^{e^{t+s}} \frac{\delta_{X_u} - \pi\left(\mu_u\right)}{u} \mathrm{d}u,$$

which is a signed measure on $\mathbb{S}^1$.

Proposition 11. *There exists a constant C_3 (that depends only on U and W) such that for all $f \in C^\infty\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ and $T, t, \delta > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} |\varepsilon_t(s) f| \geqslant \delta \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{e^t}\right) \;\leqslant\; \frac{C_3 e^{-t}}{\delta^2} \|f\|_\infty^2. \tag{7}$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$, which we abusively amalgamate as a function on M by $f(x,y) := f(x)$, so that writing $Z = (X, Y)$ and using the notations of Section 2, we get

$$\varepsilon_t(s) f = \int_{e^t}^{e^{t+s}} \frac{K^{\mu_u} f(Z_u)}{u} \mathrm{d}u = -\int_{e^t}^{e^{t+s}} \frac{L^{\mu_u} Q^{\mu_u} f(Z_u)}{u} \mathrm{d}u.$$

Let $F_t(z) = \frac{1}{t} Q_{\mu_t} f(z)$, and note that $z \mapsto F_t(z)$ is $\mathcal{C}^\infty$. On the other hand, $1 < t \mapsto F_t(z)$ is Lipschitz: indeed, from Lemma 9,

$$\begin{aligned} |Q^{\mu_{t+s}} f - Q^{\mu_t} f| \;&\leqslant\; C_2 \|f\|_\infty d_{TV}\left(\mu_{t+s}\ ,\ \mu_t\right) \\ &\leqslant\; C_2 \|f\|_\infty \frac{s}{r+t+s} \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mu_{t+s} = \frac{r+t}{r+t+s}\mu_t + \frac{s}{r+t+s}\left(\frac{1}{s}\int_t^{t+s}\delta_{X_u}\mathrm{d}u\right)$. Together with (6), that means $t \mapsto F_t(z)$ is almost everywhere differentiable with

$$|\partial_t F_t(z)| \leqslant \frac{C_2 + \frac{C_1}{\rho}}{t^2}\|f\|_\infty.$$

Itô's formula reads

$$\int_s^t L_{\mu_u} F_u(Z_u)\mathrm{d}u = F_t(Z_t) - F_s(Z_s) - \left(M_t - M_s + \int_s^t (\partial_u F_u)(Z_u)\mathrm{d}u\right),$$

where $M_t - M_s$ is a martingale with quadratic variation

$$\int_s^t \Gamma^{\mu_u}(F_u)(Z_u)\mathrm{d}u \leqslant (a + \|\partial_x V\|_\infty + \|\partial_x W\|_\infty)\left(\frac{C_1}{\rho}\|f\|_\infty\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{s} - \frac{1}{t}\right).$$

From Doob's inequality, it means that for any $T, \delta, t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|M_{e^{t+s}} - M_{e^t}| \geqslant \delta \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{e^t}\right) \leqslant \frac{(a + \|\partial_x V\|_\infty + \|\partial_x W\|_\infty)\left(\frac{C_1}{\rho}\|f\|_\infty\right)^2}{\delta^2 e^t}.$$

On the other hand,

$$|F_{e^{t+s}}(Z_{e^{t+s}}) - F_{e^t}(Z_{e^t})| \leq \frac{2C_1}{\rho}e^{-t}\|f\|_\infty$$

and

$$\left\|\int_{e^{t+s}}^{e^t}(\partial_u F_u)(Z_u)\mathrm{d}u\right\|_\infty \leq \left(C_2 + \frac{C_1}{\rho}\right)e^{-t}\|f\|_\infty.$$

Altogether, if t and δ are such that $\left(C_2 + 3\frac{C_1}{\rho}\right)e^{-t}\|f\|_\infty \leqslant \frac{\delta}{2}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|\varepsilon_t(s)f| \geqslant \delta \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{e^t}\right) &\leqslant \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|M_{e^{t+s}} - M_{e^t}| \geqslant \frac{\delta}{2}\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{e^t}\right)\\ &\leqslant \frac{C_3 e^{-t}}{\delta^2}\|f\|_\infty^2\end{aligned}$$

for some C_3. On the other hand a similar bound obviously holds when $\left(C_2 + 3\frac{C_1}{\rho}\right)e^{-t}\|f\|_\infty > \frac{\delta}{2}$ since a probability is always less than $1 < e^t < e^t\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\left(C_2 + 3\frac{C_1}{\rho}\right)e^{-t}\|f\|_\infty\right)^2$. □

3.2 Convergence toward sinks

The two following Lemmas do not require any specific new argument with respect to the work of Benaïm and Raimond:

Lemma 12. *There exists a constant C_4 (that depends only on V and W) such that for all $T, t > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}\|V_{\varepsilon_t(s)}\|_\infty \geqslant \delta \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{e^t}\right) \leqslant \frac{C_4 e^{-t}}{\delta^3}. \tag{8}$$

Proof. This is a corollary of Proposition 11, as proved in [7, Lemma 5.3]. □

Proposition 13. *Let ν be a sink of Ψ. Then there exist an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ of V_ν in $\left(\mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right), \|\cdot\|_\infty\right)$ and $T, \delta > 0$ such that for all $t \geqslant T$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_s \underset{s\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \nu\right) \quad \geqslant \quad \left(1 - \frac{C_4 e^{-t}}{\delta^3}\right) \mathbb{P}\left(\exists\ s \geqslant t\ \text{ s.t. } V_{\mu_s} \in \mathcal{U}\right)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of [7, Lemma 5.4], namely from (8) is obtained a similar estimate (see [7, Lemma 5.2]) which, together with [1, Theorem 7.3], yields Proposition 13. □

From Proposition 13 to Theorem 2, only a control argument is missing according to which the probability to be in the neighbourhood $\mathcal{U}$ is positive for large times. This is done in the following, which concludes the proof of Theorem 2:

Proposition 14. *Let $\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ and $\mathcal{U}$ be an open neighbourhood of V_ν in $\mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$. Then there exists $T > 0$ such that for all $t \geqslant T$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(V_{\mu_t} \in \mathcal{U}\right) \quad > \quad 0.$$

Proof. For a continuous function $\omega : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{S}^1$, we denote by

$$V_{\omega,t,r}(x) = U(x) + \frac{1}{r+t}\int_0^t W(x, \omega(s))\mathrm{d}s + \frac{r}{r+t}\int W(x,u)\mu_0(\mathrm{d}u).$$

We claim that it is sufficient to construct for any t large enough and any $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$ a deterministic trajectory ω on $\mathbb{S}^1$ starting at x_0 with piecewise constant unitary velocity (with a finite number of jumps) such that $V_{\omega,t,r} \in \mathcal{U}$. Indeed if we have such a trajectory, since the jump times of the process have a positive density with respect tot the Lebesgue measure, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a positive probability that the process stays at distance less than ε from the deterministic ω up to time t. For ε small enough, it implies $V_{\mu_t} \in \mathcal{U}$. So let us construct such an ω.

For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, decompose $\mathbb{S}^1 = [0, 2\pi) = \cup_{k\in[\![1,N]\!]} I_k^N$ where $I_k^N = \left[\frac{2\pi(k-1)}{N}, \frac{2\pi k}{N}\right)$, let $p_k = (1-\varepsilon)\mu(I_k) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2\pi N}$ and let $\mu_{N,\varepsilon}$ be the probability measure with density $\sum p_k 1_{I_k}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Take N and ε^{-1} large enough so that $V_{\mu_{N,\varepsilon}} \in \mathcal{U}$. Let

$$\theta \quad = \quad \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\min\{p_j,\ j \in [\![1,N]\!]\}}{p_k} 1_{I_k}$$

and h be the function from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{S}^1$ that solves $h'(t) = \theta\left(h(t)\right)$ with $h(0) = x_0$. Remark that h is periodic, and denote by t_0 its period. By construction

$$V_{h,t_0,0} \quad = \quad V_{\mu_{N,\varepsilon}}$$

and h is 1-Lipschitz, so that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists a t_0-periodic function ω with $\omega(0) = x_0$ and ω' piecewise constant in $\{-1, 1\}$ with a finite number of jumps and such that $\|\omega - h\|_\infty < \delta$. Let δ be small enough so that $V_{\omega,t_0,0} \in \mathcal{U}$. Now for a fixed initial weight r, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [kt_0, (k+1)t_0)$,

$$V_{\omega,t,r} \quad = \quad \frac{kt_0}{r+t} V_{\omega,t_0,0} + \frac{t - kt_0}{r+t} V_{\omega,t-kt_0,0} + \frac{r}{r+t}\int W(x,u)\mu_0(\mathrm{d}u).$$

Hence,

$$\|V_{\omega,t,r} - V_{\omega,t_0,0}\|_\infty \quad \leqslant \quad 2\frac{r+t_0}{r+kt_0}\|W\|_\infty$$

and for k larger than some k_0, $V_{\omega,t,r} \in \mathcal{U}$. We have proved that for any $t \geqslant T := k_0 t_0$, a deterministic trajectory ω is such that $V_{\omega,t,r} \in \mathcal{U}$, which concludes. □

3.3 Non-convergence toward saddles

In this subsection, the assumption that $W = W_+ - W_-$ where both W_+ and W_- are Mercel kernels holds, and $\mu^* \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ is a saddle of the flow induced by the vector field $F(\nu) = \pi(\nu) - \nu$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ the set of measures on $\mathbb{S}^1$, and for $m = 0$ or 1, $\mathcal{M}_m\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right) = \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right),\ \nu 1 = m\}$, where 1 is the constant function with value 1. We consider (X, Y, μ) a SIVJP, and write $Z = (X, Y)$.

Let us recall some facts whose details can be found in [7, Section 6.1-6.3]. There exists $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ endowed with an Hilbert norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geqslant c\|\cdot\|_\infty$ for some $c > 0$ (so that the identity from $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathcal{C}^0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ is continuous) and so that, moreover, the following holds:

- For all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$, $V_\nu \in \mathcal{H}$ and there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\|V_\nu\|_{\mathcal{H}} \quad \leqslant \quad C\|\nu\|_1 \tag{9}$$

  where $\|\nu\|_1 = \sup\{|\nu f|, \|f\|_\infty \leqslant 1\}$.

- There exist an Hilbert basis $(e_i)_{i\geqslant 0}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ and a sequence $s \in \{-1, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$W(x, u) \quad = \quad \sum_{i\geqslant 0} s_i e_i(x) e_i(u), \tag{10}$$

  where the convergence of the sum is uniform with respect to $x, u \in \mathbb{S}^1$.

Denoting by $\mathcal{H}_m$ the closure in $\mathcal{H}$ of $\{V_\nu,\ \nu \in \mathcal{M}_m\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)\}$, then

$$F^V(h) \ := \ U + \int W(\cdot, u) \frac{e^{-h(u)}}{\int e^{-h(r)} \mathrm{d}r} \mathrm{d}u - h,$$

from $\mathcal{H}_1$ to $\mathcal{H}_0$, which satisfies $F^V\left(V_\nu\right) = V_{F(\nu)}$, induces a global smooth flow Ψ^V on $\mathcal{H}_1$ such that for all $\nu \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$V_{\Psi_t(\nu)} = \Psi_t^V\left(V_\nu\right).$$

Moreover $h^* = V_{\mu^*}$ is a saddle of Ψ^V. We want to prove that $\mathbb{P}\left(V_{\mu_t} \xrightarrow[t\to\infty]{\mathcal{H}} h^*\right) = 0$, which will imply Theorem 4, but now we work in an Hilbert space rather than on $\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$. In particular, we have an orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{H} \quad = \quad H^u \oplus H^s$$

with $H^u \neq \{0\}$ and such that for all v in the unstable space H^u and $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|D\Psi_t(h^*)v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geqslant Ce^{\lambda|t|}\|v\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

for some $C, \lambda > 0$, where D stands for the differential operator. Denoting by

$$Stab(h^*) \quad = \quad \left\{h \in \mathcal{H}_1,\ \lim_{t\to\infty} \Psi_t^V(h) = h^*\right\}$$

the basin of attraction of h^*, we can construct a $\mathcal{C}^2$ function η from a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}$ of h^* in $\mathcal{H}$ to $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that the following holds:

- For all $h \in \mathcal{N} \cap Stab(h^*)$, $\eta(h) = 0$.
- For all $h \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$D\eta(h)Y(h) \quad \geqslant \quad 0. \tag{11}$$

- For all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{N}$ of h^* and $C_4 > 0$ such that, denoting by D^2 the Hessian operator, for all $h \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ and $u, v \in \mathcal{H}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |D^2_{u,v}\eta(h) - D^2_{u,v}\eta(h^*)| &\leqslant \varepsilon \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}} && (12)\\ |D^2_{u,v}\eta(h)| &\leqslant C_4 \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}} \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}} && (13)\\ |D\eta(h)v| &\leqslant C_4 \|v\|_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{\eta(h)} && (14)\\ 2\eta(h) D^2_{v,v}\eta(h) - (D_v\eta(h))^2 &\geqslant -C_4 \|v\|^2_{\mathcal{H}} (\eta(h))^{\frac{3}{2}}. && (15) \end{aligned}$$

  In particular, $D^2_{v,v}\eta(h^*) \geqslant 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{H}_0$.

- $$D^2_{v,v}\eta(h^*) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad v \in H^s \tag{16}$$

The function η is in some sense the square of some distance to $Stab(h^*)$. Indeed, away from $Stab(h^*)$, it necessarily increases along the flow Ψ^V (which is (11)); from (14), $\sqrt{\eta}$ is Lipschitz; and (15) implies that, at the saddle h^*, η is stricly convex in the unstable directions.

Here ends the recalls from [7]. The strategy is now the following: we will show that for any $L > 0$, if V_{μ_t} is in $\mathcal{N}$ at time t, then $s \mapsto \eta(V_{\mu_s})$ can reach the level $\frac{L}{t}$ with positive probability, and that from that level, if L is large enough, it has a positive probability not to converge to 0, which will be contradictory with $\mu_t \to \mu^*$.

More precisely, rather than with μ_t and V_{μ_t}, we will work with

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_t f &:= \mu_t f + \frac{1}{r+t} Q^{\mu_t} f(Z_t)\\ g_t &:= V_{\nu_t}. \end{aligned}$$

Namely, denoting by $V_x = U(x) + W(x, \cdot)$,

$$g_t(x) = \mu_t V_x + \frac{1}{r+t} Q^{\mu_t} V_x(Z_t).$$

Then, $(g_t)_{t \geqslant 0}$ is a $\mathcal{H}_1$-valued semimartingale.

Given $L > 0$ (to be chosen later on), a time $t > 0$ and a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}$ of h^* in $\mathcal{H}$, we consider the following stopping times:

$$\begin{aligned} S_t &= \inf\left\{ s \geqslant t,\ \eta(g_s) \geqslant \frac{L^2}{t} \right\}\\ U_t^{\mathcal{N}} &= \inf\left\{ s \geqslant t,\ \mu_s \notin \mathcal{N} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We begin with the following technical lemma:

Lemma 15. *There exists $C_5 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exist a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{N}$ of h^* in $\mathcal{H}$ and a time t_0 such that for all $t \geqslant t_0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\eta\left(g_{S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}} \right) \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right) - \eta(g_t) \geqslant \frac{-\varepsilon + C_5 \mathbb{P}\left(S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty \,\middle|\, \mathcal{F}_t \right)}{r+t}.$$

Proof. Between two jumps of the velocity Y, the evolution of g_t is deterministic and, denoting by $\tau f(X,Y) = f(X,-Y)$, for almost every $t \geqslant 0$, $\partial_t g_t = B_t$ where

$$\begin{aligned} B_t(x) &= \frac{1}{r+t}\left(V_{\delta_{X_t}}(x) - V_{\mu_t}(x) \right) + \left[\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{r+t} Q^{\mu_t} \right) + \frac{1}{r+t} Y_t \partial_X Q^{\mu_t} \right] V_x(Z_t)\\ &= \frac{1}{r+t}\left(V_{\pi(\mu_t)}(x) - V_{\mu_t}(x) \right) + \left[\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{r+t} Q^{\mu_t} \right) - \frac{\lambda(Z_t, \mu_t)}{r+t} (\tau - Id) Q^{\mu_t} \right] V_x(Z_t)\\ &= \frac{Y(g_t)(x)}{r+t} + \frac{N_t V_x}{(r+t)^2} - \frac{1}{r+t} \lambda(Z_t, \mu_t) (\tau - Id) Q^{\mu_t} V_x(Z_t), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $L^\mu Q^\mu = K^\mu$, and defined N_t by

$$N_t f \;=\; (r+t)^2 \partial_t \left(\frac{1}{r+t} Q^{\mu_t} \right) f(Z_t) + (r+t) \left(F(\mu_t) - F(\nu_t) \right) f.$$

Note that from Lemmas 8 and 9, $\|N_t\|_1 \leq C_6$ for some $C_6 > 0$. Writing $\bar{g}_t(x) = \mu_t V_x + \frac{1}{r+t} Q^{\mu_t} V_x(X_t, -Y_t)$, we thus have

$$\eta\left(g_t\right) - \eta(g_s) \;=\; M_t - M_s + \int_s^t D\eta\left(g_u\right) B_u + \lambda\left(Z_u, \mu_u\right) \left(\eta\left(\bar{g}_u\right) - \eta(g_u) \right)$$

where M_t is a martingale. For $u \geqslant 0$, set

$$R_u \;=\; \eta\left(\bar{g}_u\right) - \eta(g_u) - \left[D\eta\left(g_u\right)\left(\bar{g}_u - g_u\right) + \frac{1}{2} D^2\eta(g^*)\left(\bar{g}_u - g_u, \bar{g}_u - g_u\right) \right].$$

From (9), for some $C > 0$, $\|\bar{g}_t - g_t\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leqslant \frac{C}{\rho(r+t)}$ which, together with Inequalities (12) and (13), imply that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ of μ^* and a time t_0 such that if $g_t \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ and $t \geqslant t_0$ then $|R_t| \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{(r+t)^2}$. On the other hand we can also choose $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ so that for all $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$, $\|\lambda(\cdot, \mu) - \lambda(\cdot, \mu^*)\|_\infty \leqslant \varepsilon$, and (according to Lemma (14)), $|D\eta(V_\mu)| \leqslant \varepsilon$. Finally, denoting by

$$\bar{g}_t^*(x) - g_t^*(x) \;=\; \frac{1}{r+t} \left(Q^{\mu^*} V_x(X_t, -Y_t) - Q^{\mu^*} V_x(Z_t) \right),$$

we can also choose (using (9)) $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ and t_0 such that

$$\|\bar{g}_t^* - g_t^* - (\bar{g}_t - g_t)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \;\leqslant\; \frac{\varepsilon}{r+t}.$$

In other words, writing

$$\begin{aligned} \eta\left(g_t\right) - \eta(g_s) \;&=\; M_t - M_s + \int_s^t \left[\frac{D\eta\left(g_u\right) Y(g_u)}{r+u} + H_u \right] \mathrm{d}u \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \lambda\left(Z_u, \mu^*\right) D^2\eta(g^*)\left(\bar{g}_u^* - g_u^*, \bar{g}_u^* - g_u^*\right) \mathrm{d}u, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} H_s \;:=\; & \frac{D\eta\left(g_u\right) N_u V}{(r+u)^2} + \lambda\left(Z_u, \mu_u\right) R_u + \frac{1}{2} \lambda\left(Z_u, \mu_u\right) D^2\eta(g^*)\left(\bar{g}_u - g_u, \bar{g}_u - g_u\right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \lambda\left(Z_u, \mu^*\right) D^2\eta(g^*)\left(\bar{g}_u^* - g_u^*, \bar{g}_u^* - g_u^*\right), \end{aligned}$$

we can choose a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ and a time t_0 such that for all $t_0 \leqslant t \leqslant s \leqslant S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}$, $|H_s| \leqslant \frac{\varepsilon}{(r+s)^2}$ (we used (9) and (13) again). Taking the expectation in (17), the martingale increment vanishes, and together with (11) and the fact $D^2_{v,v}\eta \geqslant 0$ for all $v \in \mathcal{H}_0$, we have obtained so far

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\eta\left(g_{S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}} \right) \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t \right) - \eta\left(g_t\right) \;\geqslant\; -\frac{\varepsilon}{r+t} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\left(1_{S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty} \int_t^\infty \frac{1}{(r+u)^2} \Phi(Z_u) \mathrm{d}u \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t \right)$$

with (recall that $W(x,y) = \sum s_i e_i(x) e_i(y)$)

$$\Phi\left(z\right) \;:=\; \sum_{i,j} D^2_{i,j}\eta(g^*) s_i s_j \Gamma^{\mu^*}\left(Q^{\mu^*} e_i, Q^{\mu^*} e_j \right)(z).$$

From

$$\Phi(Z_u) \;=\; \mu_u \Phi + (r+u) \partial_u\left(\mu_u \Phi\right),$$

an integration by part yields

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{1}{(r+u)^2}\Phi(Z_u)\mathrm{d}u \;=\; -\frac{\mu_t\Phi}{r+t}+2\int_t^\infty \frac{\mu_u\Phi}{(r+u)^2}\mathrm{d}u.$$

We can choose the neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ so that for all $\mu\in\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$, $|\mu\Phi-\mu^*\Phi|\leqslant\varepsilon$. That way, on the event $\{S_t\wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}=\infty\}$,

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{1}{(r+u)^2}\Phi(Z_u)\mathrm{d}u \;\geqslant\; \frac{1}{r+t}\left(\mu^*\Phi-3\varepsilon\right)$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\eta\left(g_{S_t\wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}}\right)\mid\mathcal{F}_t\right)-\eta\left(g_t\right) \;\geqslant\; \frac{-4\varepsilon+\frac{1}{2}\left(\mu^*\Phi\right)\mathbb{P}\left(S_t\wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}=\infty\middle|\;\mathcal{F}_t\right)}{r+t}.$$

It remains to prove that $\mu^*\Phi>0$. Since μ^* is invariant for L^{μ^*},

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\Gamma^{\mu^*}\left(Q^{\mu^*}e_i,Q^{\mu^*}e_j\right)\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)\\
=\;&-\int\frac{\left(L^{\mu^*}Q^{\mu^*}e_i\right)Q^{\mu^*}e_j+Q^{\mu^*}e_i\left(L^{\mu^*}Q^{\mu^*}e_j\right)}{2}\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)\\
=\;&\int\int_0^\infty\frac{\left(K^{\mu_*}e_i\right)\left(P_t^{\mu^*}K^{\mu^*}e_j\right)+\left(P_t^{\mu^*}K^{\mu^*}e_i\right)\left(K^{\mu_*}e_j\right)}{2}\mathrm{d}t\;\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Denoting by $\left(P_t^{\mu^*}\right)'$ the adjoint of $P_t^{\mu^*}$ in $L^2\left(\mu^*\right)$, we write

$$\int K^{\mu^*}e_i\frac{\left(P_t^{\mu^*}\right)'+P_t^{\mu^*}}{2}K^{\mu^*}e_j\;\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right) \;=\; \int\left(R_tK^{\mu^*}e_i\right)\left(R_tK^{\mu^*}e_j\right)\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)$$

with R_t a square root of the self-adjoint operator $\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(P_t^{\mu^*}\right)'+P_t^{\mu^*}\right)$, and more precisely the unique square root which is a Markov operator. Writing

$$\begin{aligned}
v_t^z \;&:=\; \sum_i s_i\left(R_tK^{\mu^*}e_i(z)\right)e_i\\
&=\; V_{(\delta_zR_t)}-V_{\mu^*},
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain, for each $t\geqslant 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\sum_{i,j}D^2_{i,j}\eta(g^*)s_is_j\left(K^{\mu^*}e_i\right)\left(\frac{\left(P_t^{\mu^*}\right)'+P_t^{\mu^*}}{2}K^{\mu^*}e_j\right)\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)\\
=\;&\int\sum_{i,j}D^2_{i,j}\eta(g^*)s_is_j\left(R_tK^{\mu^*}e_i\right)\left(R_tK^{\mu^*}e_j\right)\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)\\
=\;&\int D^2\eta(g^*)\left(v_t^z,v_t^z\right)\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)\\
\geqslant\;&0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in order to prove

$$\mu^*\Phi=\int_0^\infty\int\sum_{i,j}D^2_{i,j}\eta(g^*)s_is_j\left(K^{\mu^*}e_i\right)\left(\frac{\left(P_t^{\mu^*}\right)'+P_t^{\mu^*}}{2}K^{\mu^*}e_j\right)\mu^*\left(\mathrm{d}z\right)\mathrm{d}t>0$$

it is sufficient to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \int \sum_{i,j} D^2_{i,j}\eta(g^*)s_i s_j \left(K^{\mu^*}e_i\right)\left(K^{\mu^*}e_j\right)\mu^*(\mathrm{d}z) \\ &= \int D^2\eta(g^*)\left(v_0^z, v_0^z\right)\mu^*(\mathrm{d}z). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu^* = \pi(\mu^*)$ admits a positive density with respect to the Lebesgue measure, $\mu^*\Phi = 0$ would imply that $D^2\eta(g^*)\left(v_0^z, v_0^z\right) = 0$ for all $z \in M$, or in other words that $v_0^z \in H^s$ for all $z \in M$. This would imply that $V_{x_1} - V_{x_2} \in H^s$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{S}^1$, and therefore, $V_m \in H^s$ for all $m \in \mathcal{M}_0\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$. This would be in contradiction with the fact that $H^u \neq \{0\}$. Thus, $\mu^*\Phi > 0$. □

This first Lemma yields the following:

Lemma 16. *There exist a neighbourhood $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{N}$ of h^* in $\mathcal{H}$, a time t_0 and $p > 0$ such that for all $t \geqslant t_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} < \infty \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right) \;\geqslant\; p.$$

Proof. From Lemma 15 and

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\eta\left(g_{S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}}\right) \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right) - \eta(g_t) \;\leqslant\; \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{L^2}{S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}} \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} < \infty \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right) &\geqslant \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{r+t}{S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}} \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right) \\ &\geqslant \frac{-\varepsilon + C_5\mathbb{P}\left(S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty \middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right)}{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(S_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} < \infty \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t\right) \;\geqslant\; \frac{-\varepsilon + C_5}{L^2 + C_5},$$

which concludes for $\varepsilon < C_5$. □

Let $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$, t_0 and p be as in Lemma 16, and consider the event

$$H \;=\; \{\liminf\ \eta(g_t) \;>\; 0\}.$$

Lemma 17. *For L large enough, there exists $t_1 > 0$ such that for all $t \geqslant t_1$, on the event $\{S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty\}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(H \mid \mathcal{F}_{S_t}\right) \;\geqslant\; \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Making use of the notations introduced in the proof of Lemma 15,

$$\sqrt{\eta(g_t)} - \sqrt{\eta(g_s)} \;=\; A_t - A_s + \int_s^t \left(\frac{D\eta(g_u)B_u}{2\sqrt{\eta(g_u)}} + \lambda(Z_u, \mu_u)\left(\sqrt{\eta(\bar{g}_u)} - \sqrt{\eta(g_u)}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}u$$

where A_t is an $\mathcal{F}_t$-martingale. Let

$$I_t \;=\; \inf_{s \in \left[S_t, U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}\right]} (A_s - A_{S_t})$$

and $T_t = \inf\{s > S_t,\ \eta(g_s) = 0\}$. On the event $\{S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}\}$, for $s \in [S_t, T_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\eta(g_s)} &\geqslant \frac{L}{\sqrt{S_t}} + I_t + \int_{S_t}^s \left(\frac{D\eta(g_u)}{2\sqrt{\eta(g_u)}} \left(\frac{Y(g_u)}{r+u} + \frac{N_u V}{(r+u)^2} \right) + \lambda(Z_u, \mu_u) \widetilde{R}_u \right) \mathrm{d}u \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \int_{S_t}^s \lambda(Z_u, \mu_u) D^2 \sqrt{\eta}(g_u) (\bar{g}_u - g_u, \bar{g}_u - g_u) \, \mathrm{d}u\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\widetilde{R}_u = \sqrt{\eta(\bar{g}_u)} - \sqrt{\eta(g_u)} - D\sqrt{\eta}(g_u)(\bar{g}_u - g_u) - \frac{1}{2} D^2 \sqrt{\eta}(g_u)(\bar{g}_u - g_u, \bar{g}_u - g_u),$$

which satisfies $|\widetilde{R}_u| \leqslant \frac{C_7}{(r+u)^2}$ for some C_7. Hence, on the event $\{S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}\} \cap \left\{ I_t \geqslant -\frac{L}{2\sqrt{S_t}} \right\}$, for $s \in [S_t, T_t \wedge U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon}]$, for some C_8,

$$\sqrt{\eta(g_s)} \geqslant \frac{L}{2\sqrt{S_t}} - \frac{C_8}{S_t}.$$

For $t \geqslant t_1$ large enough, this is greater than $\frac{L}{4\sqrt{S_t}}$. For such $t \geqslant t_1$, thus,

$$\{S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty\} \cap \left\{ I_t \geqslant -\frac{L}{2\sqrt{S_t}} \right\} \subset H.$$

On the other hand, by Doob inequality, on the event $\{S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty\}$, for some C_9, C_{10},

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(I_t < -\frac{L}{2\sqrt{S_t}} \right) &\leqslant \frac{4S_t}{L^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{S_t}^s \lambda(Z_u, \mu_u) \left(\sqrt{\eta}(\bar{g}_u) - \sqrt{\eta}(g_u) \right)^2 \mathrm{d}u \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{S_t} \right) \\ &\leqslant \frac{4S_t C_9}{L^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\int_{S_t}^s \|\bar{g}_u - g_u\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \mathrm{d}u \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_{S_t} \right) \\ &\leqslant \frac{4S_t C_{10}}{L^2 (r + S_t)}.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude by choosing $L^2 > 8C_{10}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4. We follow [7, Proof of Theorem 2.26] (with a slight modification: we believe there was something unclear in the latter about the event $\{U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} < \infty\}$). We fix L, t_0, t_1 and $\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon$ as in Lemmas 16 and 17, and let $A = \{\exists t > 0, U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty\}$. For $t \geqslant t_0 \vee t_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(H \mid \mathcal{F}_t) &\geqslant \mathbb{E}\left(1_H 1_{S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty} \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t \right) \\ &\geqslant \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}\left(S_t < U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t \right) \\ &\geqslant \frac{1}{2} \left(p - \mathbb{P}\left(U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} < \infty \;\middle|\; \mathcal{F}_t \right) \right). \qquad (18)\end{aligned}$$

Almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(H \mid \mathcal{F}_t) &\underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1_H \\ 1_{U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty} &\underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1_A,\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(\left| \mathbb{P}\left(U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right) - 1_A \right| \right) &\leqslant \mathbb{E}\left(|\mathbb{P}(A \mid \mathcal{F}_t) - 1_A| \right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\left| 1_{U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} = \infty} - 1_A \right| \right) \\ &\underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0.\end{aligned}$$

In other words, $\mathbb{P}\left(U_t^{\mathcal{N}_\varepsilon} < \infty \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right)$ converges in the L^1 sense toward 1_{A^c}, and letting t go to infinity in (18) yields

$$1_H \geqslant \frac{1}{2}(p - 1_{A^c})$$

almost surely, which implies $A \subset H$. Finally, almost surely

$$\{\mu_t \to \mu^*\} \subset A \subset H \subset \{\mu_t \nrightarrow \mu^*\}$$

so that $\mathbb{P}(\mu_t \to \mu^*) = 0$. □

4 Quadratic interaction

In this section we consider the self-interacting potential

$$W(x,z) = \rho\left(\frac{1}{2}|e^{ix} - e^{iz}|^2 - 1\right) = -\rho\cos(x-z) \tag{19}$$

for some $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\rho > 0$, W is a self-attraction potential, if $\rho < 0$ it is a self-repulsion one. We want to understand how the long-time behaviour of a SIVJP with such a self-interaction potential is affected by ρ and by the external potential U.

Recall the notation

$$\overline{\pi}_\rho(a,b)(\mathrm{d}z) = \frac{e^{-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z))}}{\int e^{-U(x)+\rho(a\cos(x)+b\sin(x))}\mathrm{d}x}\mathrm{d}z.$$

When there is no ambiguity on the value of ρ, we simply write $\overline{\pi}(a,b)$.

4.1 Without exterior potential

Benaïm, Ledoux and Raimond studied in [6] the self-interacting diffusion on the sphere with a quadratic self-interaction and no exterior potential. When U is a constant function, we recover in the piecewise deterministic case the same behaviour as in the diffusion case, which is the following: if the force is self-repulsing or if the self-attraction is not too strong, then the process does not localize, in the sense its empirical measure converges to the uniform measure on the circle, so that the particle behaves at infinity like an integrated telegraph process on the circle (as studied in [14]). In contrast, when the self-attraction is strong enough, a random direction is picked and the empirical measure of the process goes to a Gaussian law centered at this direction.

More precisely, it is proven in [6, Lemma 4.8] that the equation

$$\int \cos \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,0) = r$$

admits a positive solution, denoted by $r(\rho)$, if and only if $\rho > 2$ (as far as notations are concerned, (a,β) used in [6] correspond to (ρ, r) used here by $\rho = 4a$ and $\beta = r\rho$).

Proof of Theorem 5, point 1. The arguments are exactly those of [6, proof of Theorem 4.5], which rely only on the limiting deterministic flow, which is the same in the diffusion and the PDMP case, on the fact that the empirical measure of the self-interaction process is an asymptotic pseudo-trajectory of this flow, and on the estimate (7). □

4.2 Stability of the Gibbs measure

Let $U : \mathbb{S}^1 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth potential and denote by $m_U = \overline{\pi}(0,0)$ the associated Gibbs measure. If (X, Y, μ) is an SIVJP with potential U and with a constant W (namely there is no self-interaction and (X, Y) is a Markov process) then $\mu_t \to m_U$. When W is not constant, a necessary condition for $\mu_t \to m_U$ is that $\pi(m_U) = m_U$, or in other words, $x \mapsto \int W(x, \cdot) \mathrm{d}m_U$ is constant. When W is given by (19), this reads

$$\int \cos \mathrm{d}m_U \;=\; \int \sin \mathrm{d}m_U \;=\; 0. \tag{20}$$

Proposition 18. *Let (X, Y, μ) be a SIVJP with potential U and W, where W is given by* (19) *and U is such that* (20) *holds. Let*

$$\eta = \left(\int \sin^2 dm_U\right)\left(\int \cos^2 dm_U\right) - \left(\int \sin \times \cos dm_U\right)^2 \quad \in \left(0, \frac{1}{4}\right].$$

Then

$$\rho\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \eta}\right) < 1 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \mathbb{P}(\mu_t \to m_U) \;>\; 0$$

$$\rho\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \eta}\right) > 1 \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad \mathbb{P}(\mu_t \to m_U) \;=\; 0$$

Remark: In particular if $\rho \leqslant 0$ (self-repulsion), $\mathbb{P}(\mu_t \to m_U) \;>\; 0$.

Proof. Note that $\pi(\nu) = \overline{\pi}(\bar{\nu})$ with

$$\bar{\nu} \;=\; \left(\int \cos \mathrm{d}\nu, \int \sin \mathrm{d}\nu\right).$$

Let Ψ be the flow on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^1)$ induced by $F(\nu) = \pi(\nu) - \nu$, and $\nu_t = \Psi_t(\nu)$. Then $(a_t, b_t) = \bar{\nu}_t$ solves $\partial_t(a_t, b_t) = \overline{F}(a_t, b_t)$ where

$$\overline{F}(a, b) = \begin{pmatrix} \int \cos \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}(a, b) - a \\ \int \sin \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}(a, b) - b \end{pmatrix}.$$

By assumption, $\overline{F}(0,0) = 0$ and we compute $J_{\overline{F}}(0,0)$ the Jacobian of $\overline{F}$ at $(0,0)$:

$$J_{\overline{F}}(0,0) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \rho \int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}m_U - 1 & \rho \int \cos \times \sin \mathrm{d}m_U \\ \rho \int \cos \times \sin \mathrm{d}m_U & \rho \int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}m_U - 1 \end{pmatrix} \;:= \rho M_U - I.$$

The matrix M_U is symmetric definite positive since $TrM_U = 1$ and $\det M_U = \eta > 0$ (the strict positivity of η comes from the fact m_U admits a positive density with respect to the Lebesgue measure). The eigenvalues of $J_{\overline{F}}(0,0)$ are $\rho\left(\frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \eta}\right) - 1$.

First, suppose $\rho\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \eta}\right) > 1$. It implies $(0,0)$ is a saddle for the flow induced by $\overline{F}$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$, so that m_U is a saddle for the flow induced by F on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^1)$, and Theorem 4 concludes this case.

Second, suppose $\rho\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \eta}\right) < 1$. Then $(0,0)$ is a sink for the flow induced by $\overline{F}$. Let $G : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^1) \to \mathbb{R}^2$ be the mapping defind by $G(\nu) = \bar{\nu}$, and let

$$A \;=\; G^{-1}(0,0) \;=\; \left\{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{S}^1),\ \int \cos \mathrm{d}\nu = \int \sin \mathrm{d}\nu = 0\right\}.$$

For $\nu \in A$, $\Psi_t(\nu) = e^{-t}(\nu - m_U) + m_U$, so that m_U is a global attractor for the restriction $\Psi_{|A}$. Hence, m_U is a sink for Ψ, and Theorem 2 concludes. □

4.3 Phase transition in a symmetric double-well potential

The equation $\pi(\nu) = \nu$ with a double-well exterior potential U (on $\mathbb{R}$ rather than $\mathbb{S}^1$), together with a quadratic attraction potential W, has been studied by Tugaut in [19], motivated by the study of the McKean-Vlasov equation (5). His ideas may be adapted to our context.

Proposition 19. *Suppose U satisfies (20) and $U(z) = U(\pi - z)$ for all z. Write $A_0 = \left\{\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right),\ \int \sin d\nu = 0\right\}$.*

- *If $\rho \int \cos^2 dm_U \leqslant 1$ then*
$$A_0 \cap Fix(\pi) \ = \ \{m_U\}.$$
- *If $\rho \int \cos^2 dm_U > 1$ then $A_0 \cap Fix(\pi)$ contains exactly three points, m_U is a saddle of the flow Ψ and the two other points of $A_0 \cap Fix(\pi)$ are sinks for the restriction of Ψ to A_0.*

Proof. We keep the notations of the previous section. The symmetry assumption on U implies, in particular, that $\eta = \left(\int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}m_U\right)\left(1 - \int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}m_U\right)$ and that the eigenvalues of $J_F(0,0)$ are $\rho \int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}m_U - 1$ and $\rho \int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}m_U - 1$.

The points of $Fix(\pi)$ are all of the form $\overline{\pi}(a,b)$ where (a,b) solves

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} a & = & \frac{\int \cos(z)\exp(-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z)))\mathrm{d}z}{\int \exp(-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z)))\mathrm{d}z} \\ \\ b & = & \frac{\int \sin(z)\exp(-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z)))\mathrm{d}z}{\int \exp(-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z)))\mathrm{d}z}. \end{array}\right.$$

Multiplying both sides of these equations by $\int e^{-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z))}\mathrm{d}z$, this is equivalent to

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} 0 & = & \int(\cos(z)-a)e^{-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)+b\sin(z))}\mathrm{d}z \\ \\ 0 & = & \int(\sin(z)-b)e^{-U(z)+\rho(a\cos(z)-b\sin(z))}\mathrm{d}z. \end{array}\right. \qquad (*)$$

By assumption, $b = 0$ always solves the second part. We are led to study the zeros of the function

$$\xi(a) \ = \ \int(\cos(z)-a)e^{-U(z)+\rho a\cos(z)}\mathrm{d}z.$$

Expanding $a \mapsto e^{\rho a\cos(z)}$ and using the symmetry of U yields

$$\xi(a) \ = \ \sum_{n\geq 0}\frac{a^{2n+1}\rho^{2n}}{(2n)!}I(2n)\left(\frac{\rho I(2n+2)}{(2n+1)I(2n)} - 1\right),$$

where $I(k) = \int \cos^k(z)e^{-U(z)}\mathrm{d}z$. Obviously, if $\rho \leqslant 0$, $a\xi(a) < 0$ as soon as $a \neq 0$, while $\xi(0) = 0$, which concludes the proof in this case. In the following, we suppose $\rho > 0$. Since $n \mapsto I(2n)$ is decreasing, $\frac{\rho I(2n+2)}{(2n+1)I(2n)} - 1$ is decreasing and non-positive for n large enough. Let

$$n_c \ = \ \min\left\{n,\ \frac{I(2n+2)}{(2n+1)I(2n)} \ \leqslant \ \frac{1}{\rho}\right\}$$

so that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \xi(a) & = & \displaystyle\sum_{n=0}^{n_c-1}\frac{|\xi^{(2n+1)}(0)|}{(2n+1)!}a^{2n+1} - \sum_{n\geq n_c}\frac{|\xi^{(2n+1)}(0)|}{(2n+1)!}a^{2n+1} \\ \\ & = & \displaystyle a^{2n_c+1}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{n_c-1}\frac{|\xi^{(2n+1)}(0)|}{(2n+1)!}a^{2(n-n_c)} - \sum_{n\geq n_c}\frac{|\xi^{(2n+1)}(0)|}{(2n+1)!}a^{2(n-n_c)}\right). \end{array}$$

Both terms of the sum are non-increasing with $a > 0$, which implies ξ admits at most one positive zero. Since it is an odd function, it admits either one zero (at 0) or three (at $-a_*, 0$ and a_* for some unique $a_* > 0$). Note that $\xi(a_*) = 0$ implies $a_* = \int \cos \, \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}(a_*, 0) < 1$. Differentiating ξ with respect to a, we see that

$$\xi'(a) \quad = \quad a^{2n_c} \left(\sum_{n=0}^{n_c-1} \frac{|\xi^{(2n+1)}(0)|}{(2n)!} a^{2(n-n_c)} - \sum_{n \geq n_c} \frac{|\xi^{(2n+1)}(0)|}{(2n)!} a^{2(n-n_c)} \right)$$

is even, vanishes at most once on $(0, \infty)$ and goes to $-\infty$ at infinity. There are two possibilities:

- if $\xi'(0) \leq 0$ then $\xi'(a) \leq 0$ for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and 0 is the only zero of ξ.
- if $\xi'(0) > 0$ then ξ is positive close to zero and goes to $-\infty$ at infinity, so that it vanishes three times.

Finally $\xi'(0)$ has the same sign as

$$\frac{\rho I(2)}{I(0)} - 1 \quad = \quad \rho \int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}m_U - 1.$$

In the case where $\xi'(0) > 0$, we have $\xi'(a_*) = \xi'(-a_*) < 0$. Since

$$\partial_a \left(\frac{\xi(a)}{\int e^{-U(z)+\rho a \cos(z)} \mathrm{d}z} \right) = \frac{\xi'(a)}{\int e^{-U(z)+\rho a \cos(z)} \mathrm{d}z},$$

it means $\pm a_*$ are asymptotically stable equilibria for the flow induced by $\overline{F}$. The conclusion is now similar to the one of Proposition 18, namely we remark $\overline{\pi}(a_*, 0)$ is a global attractor for the restriction of Ψ to $G^{-1}(a_*, 0)$, and similarly for $-a_*$. □

Obviously, if $U(z) = U(-z)$, denoting by $A_0' = \left\{ \nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right), \int \cos \mathrm{d}\nu = 0 \right\}$, a similar argument (or a change of variables) proves that $A_0' \cap Fix(\pi)$ is either reduced to $\{m_U\}$ or constituted of three points, depending on the position of $\rho \int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}m_U$ with respect to 1. The potential $U(z) = -cos(2z)$ being both symmetric with respect to the horizontal and vertical axes, we already know that there may be one, three or five fixed points on the axis. The rest of the disk remains to be studied.

The proof of the following has been kindly indicated to us by Jean-Baptiste Bardet, Michel Benaïm, Florent Malrieu and Pierre-André Zitt, and will appear in a work of them (for now in progress) about self-interacting processes.

Lemma 20. *Suppose $U(z) = -\cos(2z)$. Then*

$$(A_0 \cup A_0')^c \cap Fix(\pi) \quad = \quad \emptyset.$$

Proof. We keep the previous notation $(a, b) = \overline{\nu}$ and denote by $(r, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times]-\pi, \pi]$ the polar coordinates of (a, b), such that $a + ib = re^{i\theta}$. Then $\overline{\pi}(a, b) = (a, b)$ if and only if

$$re^{i\theta} \quad = \quad \frac{\int e^{iz} \exp\left(-U(z) + \rho r \cos(z - \theta)\right) \mathrm{d}z}{\int \exp\left(-U(z) + \rho r \cos(z - \theta)\right) \mathrm{d}z}$$

which, multiplying both sides by $e^{-i\theta}$ and taking their imaginary part, implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \quad &= \quad \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin(z - \theta) \exp\left(-U(z) + \rho r \cos(z - \theta)\right) \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \quad \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \sin(z) \exp\left(\cos(2z)\cos(2\theta) - \sin(2z)\sin(2\theta) + \rho r \cos(z)\right) \mathrm{d}z. \end{aligned}$$

The change of variable $z \to -z$ on $(-\pi, 0)$ yields

$$0 \;=\; 2\int_0^\pi \sin(z)\sinh\left(\sin(2z)\sin(2\theta)\right)\exp\left(\cos(2z)\cos(2\theta)+\rho r\cos(z)\right)\mathrm{d}z$$

and the change of variable $z \to \pi - z$ on $(\pi/2, \pi)$ yields

$$0 \;=\; 4\int_0^{\pi/2} \sin(z)\sinh\left(\sin(2z)\sin(2\theta)\right)\sinh\left(\rho r\cos(z)\right)\exp\left(\cos(2z)\cos(2\theta)\right)\mathrm{d}z.$$

If $\sin(2\theta) \geqslant 0$ (resp. $\leqslant 0$), then the integrand is positive (resp. negative), which means that in fact it vanishes for all $z \in (0, \pi/2)$, namely

$$\sinh\left(\sin(2z)\sin(2\theta)\right)\sinh\left(\rho r\cos(z)\right) \;=\; 0 \qquad \forall z \in (0,\pi/2).$$

Finally, either $r = 0$, or $\theta = 0 \; mod \; \pi/2$, so that in both cases $\nu \in A_0 \cup A_0'$. □

In the following, $U(z) = -\cos(2z)$. Let $\rho_1 = \left(\int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}m_U\right)^{-1}$ and $\rho_2 = \left(\int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}m_U\right)^{-1}$. Note that

$$\rho_1 \;<\; 2 \;<\; \rho_2.$$

So far, we have proved that m_U is an unstable equilibrium of Ψ as soon as $\rho > \rho_1$, and that

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho \leqslant \rho_1 & \Rightarrow & Fix(\pi) = \{m_U\} \\ \rho_1 < \rho \leqslant \rho_2 & \Rightarrow & Fix(\pi) = \{m_U, \overline{\pi}(a_*, 0), \overline{\pi}(-a_*, 0)\} \\ \rho_2 < \rho & \Rightarrow & Fix(\pi) = \{m_U, \overline{\pi}(a_*, 0), \overline{\pi}(-a_*, 0), \overline{\pi}(0, b_*), \overline{\pi}(0, -b_*)\} \end{array}$$

where $\rho \mapsto (a_*, b_*) = (a_*(\rho), b_*(\rho)) \in (0,\infty)^2$ are given by Proposition 19.

Lemma 21. *For $\rho > \rho_2$, $\overline{\pi}(0, b_*)$ and $\overline{\pi}(0, -b_*)$ are saddles for the flow Ψ.*

Proof. The Jacobian of the vector field $\overline{F}(a, b)$ at point $(0, b_*)$ is

$$J_{\overline{F}}(0, b_*) \;=\; \begin{pmatrix} \rho\int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}(0, b_*) - 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho\int \sin^2 \overline{\pi}(0, b_*) - 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the lemma will be proved when we will have established that $\rho\int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}(0, b_*) > 1$. In the rest of the proof, we write $\overline{\pi}_\rho(b) = \overline{\pi}_\rho(0, b)$ and

$$A(\rho) \;=\; \int \cos^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b_*(\rho)).$$

First, we note that $\partial_\rho b_* > 0$, which can be seen as follows: writing, for $b > 0$,

$$g(\rho, b) \;=\; \int \sin \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b),$$

we compute

$$\partial_\rho g(\rho, b) \;=\; b\left(\int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b) - \left(\int \sin \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b)\right)^2\right) \;>\; 0.$$

On the other hand, $b_*(\rho)$ being a sink of the flow $\partial_t b_t = g(\rho, b_t) - b_t$, if $b < b_*(\rho)$ then $b < g(\rho, b)$. Thus, if $\tilde{\rho} > \rho$,

$$b \;<\; g(\rho, b) \;<\; g(\tilde{\rho}, b),$$

which means $b \neq b_*(\tilde{\rho})$ for all $b < b_*(\rho)$. In other words, $b_*(\tilde{\rho}) \geqslant b_*(\rho)$.

Second, differentiating the relation $b_* = g(\rho, b_*)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\rho b_* &= \partial_\rho(\rho b_*)\left(\int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b_*) - b_*^2\right) \\ \Rightarrow \qquad \partial_\rho b_* &= \frac{b_*\left(\int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b_*) - b_*^2\right)}{1-\rho\left(\int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b_*) - b_*^2\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\partial_\rho b_* > 0$ implies $\rho\left(\int \sin^2 \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_\rho(b_*) - (b_*)^2\right) < 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\rho(\rho b_*(\rho)) &= b_* + \frac{\rho b_*\left(1 - A(\rho) - b_*^2\right)}{1-\rho\left(1-A(\rho)-b_*^2\right)} \\ &= \frac{b_*}{1-\rho\left(1-A(\rho)-b_*^2\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

We compute

$$\partial_\rho(\rho A(\rho)) = A(\rho) + \rho\partial_\rho(\rho b_*)\left(\int \cos^2 \sin \mathrm{d}\overline{\pi}_z(b_*) - b_* A(\rho)\right).$$

Integrating by part,

$$\begin{aligned} \int \cos^2(z)\sin(z)e^{\cos(2z)+\rho b\sin(z)}\mathrm{d}z &= \int \cos^2(z)\sin(z)e^{1-2\left(\sin(z)-\frac{1}{4}\rho b\right)^2+\frac{1}{8}(\rho b)^2}\mathrm{d}z \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}\int \sin(z)e^{1-2\left(\sin(z)-\frac{1}{4}\rho b\right)^2+\frac{1}{8}(\rho b)^2}\mathrm{d}z \\ &\quad +\frac{\rho b}{4}\int \cos^2(z)e^{1-2\left(\sin(z)-\frac{1}{4}\rho b\right)^2+\frac{1}{8}(\rho b)^2}\mathrm{d}z. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\rho(\rho A(\rho)) &= A(\rho) + \frac{\rho b_*^2}{1+\rho A(\rho)-\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)}\left(-\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}\rho A(\rho) - A(\rho)\right) \\ &= A(\rho) + \frac{\rho b_*^2}{4}\left(1 + \frac{-2+\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)-4A(\rho)}{1+\rho A(\rho)-\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, in the case where $\rho A(\rho) \in (0,1]$, $\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right) < 1 + \rho A(\rho) < 2$, so that

$$\frac{-2+\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)-4A(\rho)}{1+\rho A(\rho)-\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)} \leqslant \frac{-2+\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)-4A(\rho)}{2-\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)}.$$

It means that, if $\rho A(\rho) \leqslant 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\rho(\rho A(\rho)) &\leqslant A(\rho) - \frac{A(\rho)\rho b_*^2}{2-\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)} \\ &= A(\rho)\frac{2-\rho}{2-\rho\left(1-b_*^2\right)} < 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\rho > \rho_2 > 2$. It means that, if there exists $\rho_3 > \rho_2$ such that $\rho_3 A(\rho_3) \leqslant 1$, then $\rho \mapsto \rho A(\rho)$ is strictly decreasing for $\rho \geqslant \rho_3$. This is in contradiction with the fact that $\rho A(\rho)$ converges to 1 as ρ goes to infinity. Indeed, by a Laplace method at point $z = \frac{\pi}{2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\rho, b) &:= \frac{\int \cos^2(z)e^{\cos(2z)+\rho b\sin(z)}\mathrm{d}z}{\int e^{\cos(2z)+\rho b\sin(z)}\mathrm{d}z} \\ &\underset{\rho\to\infty}{\simeq} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^2 e^{2u^2-\frac{1}{2}\rho b u^2}\mathrm{d}u}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2u^2-\frac{1}{2}\rho b u^2}\mathrm{d}u} \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho b - 4}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, b_* increasing with ρ, $\overline{\pi}_\rho(b_*)$ converges as ρ goes to infinity to a Dirac measure at point $\frac{\pi}{2}$, so that $b_* \to 1$. As a consequence,

$$\rho A(\rho) \;=\; \rho h(\rho, b_*) \underset{\rho\to\infty}{\simeq} \frac{\rho}{\rho - 4} \underset{\rho\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1.$$

Hence, for all $\rho > \rho_2$, $\rho A(\rho) > 1$, and $(0, b_*)$ is an unstable equilibrium point of the flow induced by $\overline{F}$, which concludes. □

Proof of Theorem 5, point 2. According to Theorem 1, since $Fix(\pi)$ contains a finite number of points, μ_t necessarily converges to one of those. For $\rho \leqslant \rho_c := \rho_1$, $Fix(\pi) = \{m_U\}$, hence μ_t converges to m_U. For $\rho > \rho_c$, all the fixed points which are not $(\pm a_*, 0)$ are saddles for the flow Ψ, and Theorem 4 implies that the probability that μ_t converges to one of them is 0. Thus, μ_t converges to $(\kappa a_*, 0)$ for some random $\kappa \in \{-1, 1\}$. By Theorem 4, it means either $(a_*, 0)$ or $(-a_*, 0)$ is a sink for the flow Ψ, and by symmetry they are both sinks, so that, by Theorem 2, both have a positive probability to be chosen. □

4.4 Large attraction in a multi-well potential

In this section, we suppose that U admits a minimum at $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}^1$. We use the notation

$$\overline{\pi}_\rho(r, \theta) \;=\; \overline{\pi}_\rho(a, b)$$

when $a + ib = re^{i\theta}$ (there will be no ambiguity). The Laplace method shows that, for a function $f \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{S}^1)$,

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(z) e^{\rho r(\cos(z-\theta)-1)} \mathrm{d}z \;=\; f(\theta)\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\rho r}} + \underset{\rho\to\infty}{o}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}}\right).$$

Lemma 22. *Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{S}^1)$ with $f(\theta) = 0$, and let $r_0 > 0$. Then*

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(z) e^{\rho r(\cos(z-\theta)-1)} dz \;=\; f''(\theta)\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2(\rho r)^3}} + \underset{\rho\to\infty}{o}\left(\rho^{-\frac{3}{2}}\right),$$

where the error term only depends on $\|f^{(j)}\|_\infty$, $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, and is uniform in $r \in [r_0, 1]$.

Proof. For $\rho \geqslant 1$, let $\delta = \delta(\rho) = \rho^{-\frac{1}{3}}$. Without loss of generality, we take $\theta = 0$. First,

$$\left|\int_{|z|>\delta} f(z) e^{\rho r(\cos(z)-1)} \mathrm{d}z\right| \;\leqslant\; \|f\|_\infty e^{-\frac{r\rho\delta}{\pi^2}},$$

and

$$\int_{|z|<\delta} \left|f(z) - zf'(\theta) - \frac{z^2}{2} f''(\theta)\right| e^{\rho r(\cos(z)-1)} \mathrm{d}z \;\leqslant\; \frac{\delta}{6}\|f^{(3)}\|_\infty \int_{|z|<\delta} z^2 e^{\rho r(\cos(z)-1)} \mathrm{d}z.$$

By symmetry, $\int_{|z|<\delta} z e^{\rho r(\cos(z)-1)} \mathrm{d}z = 0$. Finally,

$$\int_{|z|<\delta} z^2 e^{-\rho r\left(\frac{z^2}{2} + \frac{\delta^4}{6}\right)} \mathrm{d}z \;\leqslant\; \int_{|z|<\delta} z^2 e^{\rho r(\cos(z)-1)} \mathrm{d}z \;\leqslant\; \int_{|z|<\delta} z^2 e^{-\rho r\left(\frac{z^2}{2} - \frac{\delta^4}{6}\right)} \mathrm{d}z$$

so that, using that $\rho r \delta^3 \leqslant 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{|z|<\delta} z^2 e^{\rho r(\cos(z)-1)} \mathrm{d}z - \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{(\rho r)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right| &\leqslant \frac{e}{6}\rho r \delta^4 \int_{|z|<\delta} z^2 e^{-\rho r\frac{z^2}{2}} \mathrm{d}z + \int_{|z|>\delta} z^2 e^{-\rho r\frac{z^2}{2}} \mathrm{d}z \\ &= \underset{\rho\to\infty}{o}\left(\rho^{-\frac{3}{2}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

Recall that, for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right)$ with a Lebesgue density (still denoted ν), the free energy is defined as

$$J(\nu) \;=\; \int U(x)\nu(\mathrm{d}x) - \frac{\rho}{2}\int \cos(x-z)\nu(\mathrm{d}x)\nu(\mathrm{d}z) + \int \ln\left(\nu(x)\right)\nu(\mathrm{d}x).$$

Lemma 23. *For all $r_0 > 0$, uniformly on $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1$ and $r \in [r_0, 1]$,*

$$J\left(\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\right) - J\left(\overline{\pi}_\rho(1,x_0)\right) \underset{\rho\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} U(\theta) - U(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{r} - 1 + \ln(r)\right).$$

Proof. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} J\left(\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\right) \;=\; & -\frac{\rho}{2}\left(\int \cos(x-\theta)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right)\right)^2 - \frac{\rho}{2}\left(\int \sin(x-\theta)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right)\right)^2 \\ & + \rho r\int \left(\cos(z-\theta)-1\right)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)(\mathrm{d}z) - \ln\int e^{-U(z)+\rho r(\cos(z-\theta)-1)}\mathrm{d}z. \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma 22 and the Laplace method,

$$\rho r\int \left(\cos(z-\theta)-1\right)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)(\mathrm{d}z) \underset{\rho\to\infty}{\simeq} -\rho r\frac{e^{U(\theta)}}{2\rho r e^{U(\theta)}} \;=\; -\frac{1}{2},$$

and similarly,

$$-\frac{\rho}{2}\left(\int \left(\cos(x-\theta)-1\right)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right)\right)^2 - \frac{\rho}{2}\left(\int \sin(x-\theta)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right)\right)^2 \;=\; \rho \times \underset{\rho\to\infty}{\mathcal{O}}\left(\rho^{-2}\right)$$

so that

$$-\frac{\rho}{2}\left(\int \cos(x-\theta)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right)\right)^2 - \frac{\rho}{2}\left(\int \sin(x-\theta)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\left(\mathrm{d}x\right)\right)^2 \;=\; -\frac{\rho}{2} + \frac{1}{2r} + \underset{\rho\to\infty}{o}(1)$$

Finally,

$$\ln\left(\frac{\int e^{-U(z)+\rho r(\cos(z-\theta)-1)}\mathrm{d}z}{\int e^{-U(z)+\rho(\cos(z-x_0)-1)}\mathrm{d}z}\right) \underset{\rho\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} U(x_0) - U(\theta) - \frac{1}{2}\ln(r).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 5, point 4. Let $\varphi_0 > 0$ be small enough so that x_0 is the only minimum of U in $[x_0 - \varphi_0, x_0 + \varphi_0]$ (which should be understood as an interval of $\mathbb{S}^1$). For $\varphi \in (0, \varphi_0]$, we call

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\varphi \;&=\; \left(\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \times (x_0 - \varphi, x_0 + \varphi) \\ \partial\mathcal{D}_\varphi \;&=\; \left(\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right] \times \{x_0 - \varphi, x_0 + \varphi\}\right) \cup \left(\left\{\frac{1}{2}\right\} \times (x_0 - \varphi, x_0 + \varphi)\right). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, seen in the complex unitary disk by $r, \theta \mapsto re^{i\theta} = w$, $\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ is a sector centred at x_0 and of angle 2φ of the band $r_0 < |w| \leqslant 1$, and $\partial\mathcal{D}_\varphi$ is its boundary (inside the unitary disk).

We fix $\delta > 0$. From Lemma 23, we chose φ small enough and ρ_0 large enough so that

$$\eta \;:=\; \inf_{(r,\theta)\in\partial\mathcal{D}_\varphi} J\left(\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta)\right) - J\left(\overline{\pi}_\rho(1,x_0)\right) \;>\; 0$$

and

$$\sup_{(r,\theta)\in\mathcal{D}_\varphi} \int dist^2_{\mathbb{S}^1}(z,x_0)\overline{\pi}_\rho(r,\theta) \;<\; \delta$$

for all $\rho > \rho_0$. Since J is non-decreasing along the flow Ψ,

$$B \;:=\; \left\{\nu \in \mathcal{P}\left(\mathbb{S}^1\right), \overline{\nu} \in D_\varphi, J\left(\nu\right) < J\left(\overline{\pi}_\rho(1, x_0)\right) + \frac{\eta}{2}\right\}$$

is a non-empty, Ψ-invariant, open set. Let $L(B)$ be the set of limit points of sequences $\left(\Psi_{t_k}(\nu)\right)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\nu \in B$. Then $L(B)$ is an attractor in the sense of [1, Section 5.1 p.22], and [1, Theorem 7.3] together with our controllability result (Proposition 14) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(d_w\left(\mu_t, L(B)\right) \underset{t\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0\right) \;>\; 0$$

(see also [6, Proposition 4.13]). In particular,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\exists t_0 > 0,\ \mu_t \in \mathcal{D}_\varphi \forall t > t_0\right) \;>\; 0,$$

which concludes. □

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank, on the ond hand, Michel Benaïm and Carl-Eric Gauthier for fruitful discussions about asymptotic pseudotrajectories, and on the other hand Jean-Baptiste Bardet, Florent Malrieu and Pierre-André Zitt for their help in the quadratic interaction case. We acknowledge financial support from the Swiss National Science Foundation Grant 200020-149871/1.

References

[1] M. Benaïm. Dynamics of stochastic approximation algorithms. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXIII*, volume 1709 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–68. Springer, Berlin, 1999.

[2] M. Benaïm. *On Gradient Like Properties of Population Games, Learning Models and Self Reinforced Processes*, pages 117–152. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2015.

[3] M. Benaïm and C.-É. Bréhier. Convergence of adaptive biasing potential methods for diffusions. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 354(8):842–846, 2016.

[4] M. Benaïm, I. Ciotir, and C.-E. Gauthier. Self-repelling diffusions via an infinite dimensional approach. *ArXiv e-prints*, August 2014.

[5] M. Benaïm and M. W. Hirsch. Asymptotic pseudotrajectories and chain recurrent flows, with applications. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, 8(1):141–176, 1996.

[6] M. Benaïm, M. Ledoux, and O. Raimond. Self-interacting diffusions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 122(1):1–41, 2002.

[7] M. Benaïm and O. Raimond. Self-interacting diffusions. III. Symmetric interactions. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(5):1717–1759, 2005.

[8] J. Bierkens, P. Fearnhead, and G. Roberts. The Zig-Zag Process and Super-Efficient Sampling for Bayesian Analysis of Big Data. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2016.

[9] A. Bouchard-Côté, S. J. Vollmer, and A. Doucet. The Bouncy Particle Sampler: A Non-Reversible Rejection-Free Markov Chain Monte Carlo Method. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2015.

[10] V. Calvez, G. Raoul, and C. Schmeiser. Confinement by biased velocity jumps: aggregation of *escherichia coli*. *Kinet. Relat. Models*, 8(4):651–666, 2015.

[11] J. Fontbona, H. Guérin, and F. Malrieu. Long time behavior of telegraph processes under convex potentials. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 126(10):3077–3101, 2016.

[12] C.-E. Gauthier and P. Monmarché. Strongly self-interacting processes on the circle. *ArXiv e-prints*, June 2016.

[13] F. Malrieu. Some simple but challenging Markov processes. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 24(4):857–883, 2015.

[14] L. Miclo and P. Monmarché. Étude spectrale minutieuse de processus moins indécis que les autres. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 2078:459.

[15] P. Monmarché. Piecewise deterministic simulated annealing. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 13(1):357–398, 2016.

[16] R. Pemantle. A survey of random processes with reinforcement. *Probab. Surv.*, 4:1–79, 2007.

[17] E. A. J. F. Peters and G. de With. Rejection-free monte carlo sampling for general potentials. *Phys. Rev. E 85, 026703*, 2012.

[18] O. Raimond. Self-attracting diffusions: case of the constant interaction. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 107(2):177–196, 1997.

[19] J. Tugaut. Phase transitions of McKean-Vlasov processes in double-wells landscape. *Stochastics*, 86(2):257–284, 2014.